REMARKS

In the Office Action dated August 10, 2005, claims 1-36 are pending. Claims 1, 22, 24, and 33 are independent claims from which all other claims depend therefrom. Claims 1, 22, 24, and 33 are herein amended. Claims 37-38 are newly added.

Claims 1-21 stand are objected to for an informality reason. Specifically, the Office Action states that claim 1 appears incomplete and is not a sentence. Claim 1 is herein amended to correct such incompletion.

Claims 1-36 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Clark (U.S. Pat. No. 6,850,187) and as also being anticipated by Green et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,667,713).

Claims 1, 22, and 33 have similar limitations and are thus described together. Claims 1, 22, and 33 recite navigation systems and a method of operating a navigation system. The systems and method include the limitation of generating a multiple signals via one or more non-geostationary satellites. The signals include integrity information that is generated offboard the satellites. Range and position of the non-geostationary satellites and accuracy or reliability of that range or position are determined in response to the signals. In claims 1 and 22 the range, position, accuracy, and reliability information is determined via a navigation receiver.

The present invention allows the accuracy and reliability information to be determined offboard a satellite and by a navigation receiver. The information is determined using ground reference station equipment, although not specifically recited, and an end user navigation equipment, such as that on an aircraft. The advantage to this is that hardware changes are not needed to existing satellite equipment, which can be expensive.

Clark is directed to a satellite integrity monitor. Green is directed to a self-monitoring satellite system. The solutions provided by both Clark and Green are space-centric solutions, which monitor and determine integrity

information onboard a satellite. Clark provides an on-board system for each GPS satellite itself to verify the accuracy and/or integrity of its own operations. Calculations and processing to determine satellite integrity is performed internal to the GPS satellites and by crosslink communications with other GPS satellites in the GPS constellation. See the Abstract of Clark. Green provides a satellite that has an on-board receiver and monitoring processor for observing and evaluating a signal sent from the satellite to determine the reliability of the signal. The processor of Green generates warning signals that are transmitted to users to indicate that particular satellite signals may be unreliable. See the Abstract of Green.

Both Clark and Green fail to teach or suggest the limitations of one or more non-geostationary satellites generating signals that have offboard generated integrity information and a navigation receiver that determines accuracy and reliability information in response thereto. The integrity information of both Clark and Green is originated and generated within a satellite itself and is then transmitted to an end user. The end users or GPS receivers referred to in Clark and Green do not determine accuracy and reliability information, but rather are provided with such information. Note also that both of the systems of Clark and Green require hardware changes to be made to existing satellites.

Claim 24 is directed to a navigation receiver and also includes the limitations of receiving signals from a non-geostationary satellite that has integrity information, which is generated offboard the satellite. The navigation receiver determines the range and position of the satellite and accuracy thereof in response to the signals. As similarly stated above, these limitations are not taught or suggested by Clark or Green.

In order for a reference to anticipate a claim the reference must teach or suggest each and every element of that claim, see MPEP 2131 and *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628. Therefore, claims 1, 22, 24, and 33 are novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance. Since

claims 2-21, 23, 25-32, and 34-38 depend from claims 1, 22, 24, and 33, respectively, they too are novel, nonobvious, and are in a condition for allowance for at least the same reasons.

In light of the amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of the objections and rejections are now overcome. The Applicant has added no new matter to the application by these amendments. The application is now in condition for allowance and expeditious notice thereof is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner have any questions or comments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0476

Respectfully submitted,

ARTZ & ARTZ P.C.

Jeffrey J. Chapp, Reg. No. 50,579
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, MI 48034
(248) 223-9500

Dated: November 10, 2005